

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Prior to entry of this Amendment, the application included claims 1-66. Claims 1, 6, 7, 11, 24, 39, 42, 45, 48 and 51-66 have been amended. No claims have been canceled or added. Hence, after entry of this Amendment, claims 1-66 stand pending for examination.

Claims 1-50 and 52-66 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 10-12, 24, 26, 39, 42, 45, 48 and 51-66 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by the cited portions of U.S. Patent No. 6,061,799 to Eldridge et al. (“Eldridge”).

Claims 3, 4, 8, 9, 13-23, 25, 27-38, 40, 41, 43, 44, 46, 47, 49 and 50 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, set forth in the Office Action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

All pending claims have been amended to address the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection. The term “pseudo-valid” has been used in place of “bogus.” This term is supported throughout the specification. Hence, the amendments are believed to overcome the rejections.

The Applicants thank the Examiner for assisting with this amendment by reviewing this revised language prior to filing.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)

The Applicants believe that the amendments herein place all pending claims in condition for allowance. Prior to amendment, use of the phrase “generating a bogus

secret/matrix/state information” was broadly interpreted by the Examiner as “generating a secret.” In light of the amendments herein, however, this interpretation would be improper. Claim 1, for example, recites “wherein said candidate secret comprises a pseudo-valid secret configured to camouflage said secret if said candidate password is not said password.” Eldridge does not teach a pseudo-valid secret. Moreover, Eldridge’s password is not “configured to camouflage said secret if said candidate password is not said password” as claim 1 recites. Hence, claim 1 is believed to be allowable. The remaining claims are believed to be allowable for similar reasons.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 7, 2007

/Irvin E. Branch/
Irvin E. Branch
Reg. No. 42,358

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
IEB/jln
61027599 v1